

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to their undersigned attorney in the interview held November 9, 2005.

Independent claims 1, 28, 31, 38, 41-44, and 53 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 over Zdepski. Claim 56 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 over Zdepski in combination with Zigmond. Applicants have overcome these rejections by amending claims 1, 28, 31, 38, 41-44, 53, and 56. The amended independent claims include features exemplified by claim 1. Claim 1 includes the feature of extracting a “unique processor component identification parameter.” Neither Zdepski nor Zigmond teach this claimed feature.

In the interview, the Examiner stated that the term “unique processor identification parameter” as it appeared in applicant’s response filed June 23, 2005, reads on any symbol or set of symbols used in computational processing. Therefore, the Examiner concluded that this claimed feature is taught by the trigger of Zdepski. Applicants submit that the amendment to the independent claims clarifies that the extracted processor identification parameter of the claims identifies a physical processor component and is not taught by the a trigger of Zdepski.

Zdepski discloses that a trigger insertion unit receives a television signal and combines the signal with a trigger to generate a combined television-trigger signal. The trigger is described to include command information to control the loading and/or playing of an interactive program associated with the television signal. Specifically, the trigger includes an Interactive Program ID field and a Command Code field. The Interactive Program ID field contains a value to identify designated interactive program content and the Command Control values are defined to cause the interactive program to load, play, or stop. Zdepski further describes that the trigger is extracted by a trigger extraction unit. Thus, it is clear from Zdepski that the trigger identifies television programming content which can be presented to a viewer interactively.

Applicants respectfully submit that the trigger extraction of Zdepski does not teach the claimed extraction of a “unique processor component identification parameter.” Figure 2 of the application illustrates that processor (134) can be incorporated into generic meta data substitution component (130). Furthermore, the specification at page 7, lines 3-5, describes that “the data modification unit comprises a data stripper, a processor configured to execute the instruction set,

and an inserter.” A component that is capable of executing an instruction set cannot be an abstract concept, interactive program content, or merely information such as the “symbol or set of symbols” disclosed by Zdepski. Therefore, it is clear that the trigger of Zdepski does not and cannot teach the “unique processor component identification parameter” of the claims as amended.

Zigmund also does not teach a “unique processor component identification parameter.” Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of independent claims as amended is neither disclosed nor suggested by Zdepski or Zigmund, and an early Action allowing claims 1-56 is solicited.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 559442001400.

Dated: November 22, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

James M. Denaro

Registration No.: 54,063
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7739